



Child and Family Services Review, Program Improvement Plan

IV. PIP Matrix

State: California

Type of Report: Quarter 8

Date Initially Submitted: July 29, 2011

CBRO Feedback on California's CFSR 8th Quarterly Report

Part A: Strategy Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report

Primary Strategy: 1. Expand use of participatory case planning strategies.		Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Permanency Outcome 2 , Well-Being Outcomes 1 and 2, Case Review System, and Service Array .			
Goal: Increase engagement of children/youth, families and others in case planning and decision-making processes across the life of the case for safety, permanency, and well-being.		Applicable CFSR Items: Items 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 37 , 29, 26, 27, & 28			
Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion (EOC)	Qtr Due	Status of EOC	Quarterly Update
1.1 Determine baseline and assess utilization of participatory case planning practices.	CDSS (Richard Smith and Karen Gunderson)	Evidence of completion of step 1.1 (1.1.1 through 1.1.4).	Q4	Done 2/7/11	
1.1.1 Review and revise Permanency Protocols based on lessons learned through 11-county pilot; disseminate revised protocols.		Issued All County Letter with revised protocols.	Q2 Q3	Done 08/23/10	Quarter was changed from Q2 to reflect additional time needed to determine if the findings of the 11-county pilot necessitate revisions of the Permanency Protocols. Due to the budget crisis, the evaluation contract on the pilot evaluation was suspended for a period and the report is not yet available for review. Revised Permanency Protocols issued via All County Information Notice (I-24-10) on March 26, 2010. Pending--Although the CDSS

					<p>issued the ACIN it only re-issuance without modifications. The evidence provided is not responsive to the approved action step. The step called for a revision of the original pilot protocols based on lessons learned. The document provided is a reissue of the same 2005 protocols without revision. In addition, we note that the 11 County Pilot evaluation report made recommendations that are not included in the reissued protocols. (CBRO 5/12/10)</p> <p>Based on information the CDSS provided during the onsite PIP assessment meeting about the process (CDSS staff meetings) used to determine whether revisions needed to be made to the process ACF will accept what has been provided (CBRO 08/23/10).</p>
1.1.2	Develop procedures for county data entry of participatory case planning activities; and release ACIN with data entry instructions to counties.	CDSS (Richard Smith and Lindsay Farris)	Issued All County Information Notice with data entry instructions.	Q1	<p>Done 11/17/09</p> <p>The ACIN (I-67-09) on participatory case planning activities (family engagement) was issued September 2009. A copy of the issued ACIN has been provided as evidence of completion.</p>
1.1.3	Methodology for measuring family engagement efforts finalized		Methodology instruction manual.	Q1	<p>Done 11/24/20</p> <p>The family engagement efforts methodology instructions were finalized September 2009. A copy of the methodology instructions has been provided</p>

					<p>as evidence of completion.</p> <p>State provided their SAS files programs and instructions (CBRO 11/24/09)</p>
1.1.4 Baseline calculated.		Revised PIP with baseline.	Q4	<p>Done 02/7/11</p>	<p>Family engagement efforts baseline calculated (reference Item 18, Section B).</p> <p>CB is still working with CDSS to assess and validate the methodology and data provided. There is concern that the data may not be reflective of the actual casework practice for family engagement. CDSS is working with CB to provide a better data source and baseline. (CBRO 08/23/10)</p> <p><i>CDSS has indicated that the TDM data based for counties using this practice is a better reflection of the states work on engaging parents and youth in the development of the case plan. CB has indicated that it will accept the TDM as the data source for this action but is still awaiting the state's revised methodology for this action. (CBRO 12/15/10)</i></p> <p>On 2/4/11 the state submitted an approvable methodology for Item 18 (engaging parents in the development of the case plan) and baseline data. (CBRO</p>

					02/28/11)
1.2	Review and update core curricula on various models of participatory case planning and decision-making practices to address children's safety, permanency and well-being at all decision points and throughout the life of the case.	CDSS (Linne Stout) CalSWEC (Barry Johnson)	Revised curriculum sections.	Q4	<p>Done 02/15/11</p> <p>Updated core curricula sections submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><i>CDSS should clarify which sections of the Core curricula were updated "... to provide various models of participatory case planning and decision making practices to...throughout the life of the case."</i> (CBRO 12/08/10)</p> <p>On 2/10/11 the CDSS submitted documentation to clarify which sections of the curriculum that was submitted in QRT 4 were revised. (CBRO 02/28/11)</p>
1.2.1	Implement updated core curriculum.		One training agenda in which the revised curriculum was provided.	Q5	<p>Done 02/15/11</p> <p>Copy of training agenda and announcement submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>1.2.1-pending--The agenda provided appears to be a generic agenda that is included in the trainers resources guide. We are requesting an agenda or some other additional documentation to show that folks are being trained using this revised curriculum.(CBRO 08/23/10)</p> <p><i>On 09/07/10 the state submitted a word document with information that indicates that the curriculum</i></p>

					<p><i>was updated in September 2010 but there is still no document supporting that the trainers are training-using the revised curriculum. CDSS must provide. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p><i>On 12/27/10 the state submitted training agendas to show that the revised training curriculum was being implemented but approving this item was on hold until the CDSS confirmed which sections of the curriculum were revised. (CBRO 02/28/11)</i></p>
1.3	Develop advanced training module on specific strategies for engagement of fathers and related materials to address organizational culture change.	CDSS (Linne Stout) CalSWEC (Barry Johnson)	Copy of Engaging Fathers Curriculum	Q4	<p>Done 09/21/10</p> <p>A copy of the advanced training module on specific strategies for engagement of fathers submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>1.3—pending--The evidence provided is a curriculum that was developed by the Family Preservation Network and is copyrighted. The concern was that the action step involved the development and implementation of a curriculum that focused on engaging fathers rather than the purchase of an existing copyrighted curriculum, which does not give the state the rights to the curriculum. We are not sure how such a curriculum informs systemic change for</p>

					<p>training purposes in the State. We understand from the conversation today that the curriculum was purchased by one of the contracted training academies and another is also training using the curriculum. Other Academies are in the process of developing a curriculum. (CBRO 08/23/10)</p> <p>On 9/7/10 the state provided a list of participates from the Northern Training Academy who participated in this training. (09/21/10)</p> <p>We will accept the state's purchased curriculum as meeting the criteria—noting that other academies are in the process of also developing a curriculum aimed at engaging fathers. (CBRO 09/21/10)</p>
1.3.1	Implement advanced training on engaging fathers.		One training agenda in which the curriculum was provided.	Q5	<p><i>Done 09/21/10</i></p> <p>Training agenda in which the curriculum was provided is submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><i>On 9/7/10 the state provided a list of participates from the Northern Training Academy who participated in this training. (CBRO 09/21/10)</i></p>

1.4	Develop family engagement and participatory case planning guidelines for Linkages Project.	CDSS-OCAP (Linne Stout) CFPIC (Danna Fabella)	Copy of developed guidelines and list of counties receiving guidelines.	Q2	Done 02/24/10	A copy of ACIN I-70-09 (11/23/09) is provided as evidence of completion.
1.4.1	Incorporate guidelines into Linkages semi-annual meetings.		One meeting agenda in which the guidelines were provided.	Q3	Done 05/12/10	Linkages semiannual meeting agenda in which the guidelines were discussed in general session on September 16, 2009.
1.4.2	Survey counties for implementation of practice.		Survey results summary and list of who received the results.	Q4	Done 09/21/10	Survey results and distribution list submitted as evidence of completion. CDSS clarified on 8/30/10 that the survey results that were provided is a compilation of all of the linkage counties. (CBRO 09/21/10)
1.5	Examine fiscal implications of participatory practices.	CDSS (Barbara Eaton)	Copy of fiscal implications report addressed to CDSS Deputy Director.	Q6	5/23/11	Copy of letter submitted as evidence of completion. Although the CDSS submitted a letter from the CFSR coordinator indicating the fiscal implications for participatory case planning. There are several concerns about the document that was submitted. First, it was prepared by the CFSR coordinator and not CDSS's lead on the date that the report was submitted to ACF. In addition, the action represents an analysis of general case management

					responsibilities that could have been completed sooner rather than later. Before CB can consider this action complete, we would like to understand the implications on participatory case planning for the linkages project TDM as well as other participatory case plan models identified in action 1.2. (CBRO 02/28/11)
Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks– Submitted 1/29/2010					
1.1.1 Review and revise Permanency Protocols based on lessons learned through 11-county pilot; disseminate revised protocols.		Issued All County Letter with revised protocols.	Q2 Q3		Quarter was changed from Q2 to reflect additional time needed to determine if the findings of the 11-county pilot necessitate revisions of the Permanency Protocols. Due to the budget crisis, the evaluation contract on the pilot evaluation was suspended for a period and the report is not yet available for review.

Primary Strategy: 2. Sustain and enhance permanency efforts across the life of the case.		Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Permanency Outcome 1 and 2, Well-Being Outcome 1, and Case Review System.			
Goal: Enhance practices and strategies that result in more children/youth having permanent homes and connections to communities, culture and important adults.		Applicable CFSR Items: Items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 26, 27, 28			
Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Status of EOC	Quarterly Update
2.1 Increase efforts to locate mothers, fathers, and maternal/paternal family members at case onset and strengthen connections across life of the case	CDSS (Karen Gunderson and Richard Smith)	Evidence of completion of step 2.1 (2.1.1 through 2.1.2).	Q6	Done 05/09/11	
2.1.1 Develop and disseminate protocols.		Issued All County Information Notice	Q5	Done 05/09/11	<p>Copy of DRAFT ACIN submitted as evidence of completion (Final to be submitted shortly).</p> <p><i>CDSS submitted a draft of the ACIN to be issued and indicated verbally that the draft is going through sign-off. However, CB can not consider this action complete because the draft ACIN only reference a publication about relative searches but does not specify what California's protocols are nor is the ACIN final. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>Pending –the CDSS has not provided an update of revision to the item since the incomplete submission made in the 5th quarter report. (CBRO 02/28/11)</p>

					<p><u>Clarification sent via email to Region IX, Wed 4/13/2011, 8:02 AM</u></p> <p>On April 13/2011 the CDSS submitted two ACINs 09-86, which notifies counties about AB938 to provide notifications to relatives when a child is placed out-of-home and the processes for due diligent relative searches. This ACIN will suffice to meet his action step.</p> <p>ACIN 1-67-09 provides information about the PIP measure for Item 18—Family Engagement Efforts and data collecting. (CBRO 05/09/11)</p>
2.1.2 Measure increase of finding families practices by determining the number of entry children whose placement is with a relative at 60 days.		Revised PIP with quarterly data.	Q6	Done 02/15/11	<p>See Section B. Item Specific and Quantitative Measures (baseline and target have been established and target has been met).</p> <p>On 02/15/11 CDSS submitted data indicating that the target for this action associated with data measure 2.1 has increase and that the target is met (CBRO 02/28/11)</p>
2.2 Improve potential for reunification.		Evidence of completion of step 2.2 (2.2.1 through 2.2.2).	Q4	Done 2/15/11	See below

<p>2.2.1 Development of legislative proposal for trial home visits.</p>	<p>CDSS (Karen Gunderson), AOC (Jennifer</p>	<p>Copy of submitted legislative proposal.</p>	<p>Q4</p>	<p>Done 2/15/11</p>	<p>Copy of submitted legislative proposal for trial home visits is provided as evidence of completion.</p> <p>2.2.1—pending--The document that was provided as evidence of completion is not signed. We need to have a copy of the signed copy that went forward as the "official" proposal. What makes the document official? Please provide a signed copy of the "official document."(CBRO 08/23/10)</p> <p><i>On 11/18/10 CDSS reported that they are unable to implement this legislative proposal because there attorney determined that to do trial home visits in CA was illegal. They indicated that the Draft never got out of the department for that reason. They said there should be a letter that they could get from the attorney advising them of this. (12/08/10)</i></p> <p>On 2/15/11 the CDSS submitted a letter to the RO from the Deputy Director indicating that the CDSS began the process to submit the draft proposal for legislation to permit trial home visits but were advised to discontinue the process due to changes with state liability and TANF benefits to families. (CBRO 02/28/11)</p>
---	--	--	-----------	-------------------------	--

2.2.2 Promote “cultural brokers” and family advocate/mentor models through dissemination of promising/evidence based practices.	Walter; Leah Wilson) CDSS-OCAP (Linne Stout)	Issued All County Information Notice	Q3 Q4	Done 09/21/10	<p>Quarter is being changed to reflect additional time needed to complete the ACIN and dissemination.</p> <p>The draft ACIN (I-XX-XX) on Promotion of “cultural brokers” and family advocate/mentor models is submitted. A copy of the draft ACIN has been provided as evidence of completion.</p> <p>2.2.2.—pending-- The ACIN that was submitted is a draft and has yet to be issued. We are unable to consider this action complete until the ACIN is final and issued. In addition, The Qrt due was changed from Q3 to Q4 and should not have been. Even though the state was late in meeting this action it does not constitute a change in the due date. The due date remains quarter 3 as this was not a renegotiated action. (CBRO 08/23/10)</p> <p>On 9/9/10 –the state submitted an electronic weblink to show that the ACIN was finalized and issued as of 9/7/10. (CBRO 09/21/10)</p>
2.3 Assess quality of social worker visits with parents and children.	CDSS (Richard Smith)	Evidence of completion of step 2.3 (2.3.1 through 2.3.2).	Q8	Done 10/08/10	

2.3.1 Finalize methodology and tool for case reviews		Copy of methodology and tool	Q2	<p>Done 10/08/10</p>	<p>Case selection methodology and tool are provided as evidence of completion.</p> <p>The state provided the methodology for this measure but CB needs more information and clarification before this can be approved (CBRO 2/24/10)</p> <p>Pending--Detail of how the numerator and denominator were calculated for the baselines. Provide the number of applicable cases for each item. – including both item 20 instrument questions.</p> <p>Include the summary roll-up of the 12 counties and the results of the reviews by county including applicable cases, numerators and denominators by case category.</p> <p>Specifics on how the instrument questions are summarized – Example: is the numerator the cases that have Yes or NA for all of the questions listed? How are cases rated as NA – criteria used? When parent is NA how is that determined to be appropriate?</p> <p>Provide information on the number of cases scored as No because documentation was not in the online record.</p>
--	--	------------------------------	----	--------------------------	---

					<p>Include the case selection methodology for determining the number of cases selected by county and if it is a random selection. Include any case elimination criteria. (CBRO 5/27/10)</p>
2.3.2 Establish baseline level of quality of visits		PIP quarterly report	Q2	<p><i>Done</i> 10/08/10</p>	<p>Baseline and target improvement are found in Part B.</p> <p>The state provided the methodology for this measure but CB needs more information and clarification before this can be approved (RO 2/24/10)</p> <p>Pending--See the comment in 2.3.1. ACF need's more detail and back up information including the number of cases in the denominator and the numerator and the back up documents. (CBRO 5/27/10)</p>
<p>2.4 Utilize Caregiver Advisory Group the Quality Parenting Initiative (a collaborative project by Youth Law Center, California Department of Social Services and the California Welfare Director's Association) to identify and make recommendations related to reducing/removing barriers to permanence.</p>	<p>CDSS (Karen Gunderson)</p>	<p>Evidence of completion of step 2.4 (2.4.1).</p>	<p>Q5 Q8</p>	<p><u>Done</u> <u>08/15/11</u></p>	<p>CDSS has submitted a proposal to renegotiate (CBRO 10/1/10)</p> <p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions. 2.4 CB has not approved this proposed change in the PIP. CBRO has indicated to the state that rather than delete this action from the PIP, CB would agree to the action being folded in to the work of advisory workgroup for the youth law center</p>

					<i>recruitment and retention project. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i> See request below 2/2011
2.4.1 Submit recommendation to CDSS management for consideration of implementation.		Copy of meeting agenda in which the Caregivers Advisory Group <u>Quality Parenting Initiative's recommendations were discussed.</u>	Q5 Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/15/11</u>	<p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>2.4 CB has not approved this proposed change in the PIP. CBRO has indicated to the state that rather than delete this action from the PIP, CB would agree to the action being folded in to the work of advisory workgroup for the youth law center recruitment and retention project. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i> See request below 2/2011</p> <p>Meeting agenda indicating the QPI's initiatives were discussed submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>The CDSS Submitted an agenda from the Child Advocate Network meeting dated June 1, 2011. On the agenda is a segment that includes QPI Recommendation however, we are unable to determine what the recommendations are. ACF is requesting a meeting with the leads for the QPI to better understand the program and the recommendations. (CBRO 08/8/11)</u></p>

					<u>During a conference call with YLC and CDSS to better understand the QPI and determine whether the agenda that was submitted met the requirement of the PIP, the ACF learned that recommendations and lesson learned are always apart of the agenda for this program. According to Carole Shauffer, this is the opportunity for participating counties to share their lessons learned with other counties and to make recommendations about what is and/or is not working as they are rolling out the Initiative. Based on this clarification (08/15/11) the CBRO will accept the Agenda that was submitted by CDSS (CBRO 09/06/11)</u>	
2.5	CA Child Welfare Evidence Based Clearinghouse will identify and publish evidence based practices related to post-permanency services.	CDSS/OCAP (Linne Stout)	Copy of website where the evidence based practices are posted and URL.	Q4	Done 08/23/10	URL on identified and published evidence based practices related to post-permanency services provided as evidence of completion.
2.6	AOC will provide ongoing training and TA to dependency courts and stakeholders regarding reunification, tribal engagement, concurrent planning and participatory case planning.	AOC (Jennifer Walter)	Two court training agendas in which one or more of the topic items in 2.6 were provided.	Q6	Done 05/19/11	Two court training agendas submitted as evidence of completion. Pending--CDSS submitted agenda's (on 1/30 and 2//18/11) for training by AOC. However, the training agenda's don't address the topics (reunification, tribal engagement, concurrent planning and participatory case planning)

					<p>included in the action. In order for this action to be considered complete the state must provide documentation that the courts were trained on the topics identified in this action. (CBRO 02/28/11)</p> <p>Pending –CDSS provided no additional update to the information that was provided on 2/28/11 CBRO 05/09/11)</p> <p>On May 19, the AOC</p>
2.7 Implement Resource Family Approval Pilot in 5 counties.	CDSS (Karen Gunderson)	Evidence of completion of step 2.7 (2.7.1 through 2.7.3) <u>and letters to five counties notifying them of inclusion in the pilot.</u>	Q5 Q8	<p><u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u></p>	<p>The change identified in red text in the left column is a proposed revision. See request below 2/2011</p> <p><u>CDSS submitted five letters that were issued to counties informing them of approval into the pilot. (CBRO 8/8/11)</u></p>
2.7.1 Select counties.		List of counties selected.	Q2 Q3	<p>Done 08/31/10</p>	<p>Quarter was changed from Q2 to reflect additional time needed to complete selection of counties. This was delayed due to budget issues.</p> <p>The Administration has proposed legislation suspending the pilot until there is funding. CDSS cannot continue with the pilot until that is resolved.</p> <p>Pending—the state provided information on its county selection</p>

					<p>process to document that it was moving towards county selection even though they did not finalize the selection. If the State is requesting suspending this action step because of budget – please provide proposed replacement strategy to address the items that contributed to a determination of nonconformity for each outcome or systemic factor originally targeted with this action step. (CBRO 5/27/10)</p> <p>CBRO will accept this action as complete but the state will need to renegotiate what it now intends to do (i.e. renegotiate action 2.7.2) since state budget prevented implementation of this program. (CBRO8/31/10)</p> <p>See below (2.7.2).</p> <p>Approved 3/2010</p>
2.7.2 Convene workgroup to develop implementation requirements.		<p>One meeting agenda which indicates the implementation requirements were discussed. <u>CDSS will notify the five counties that were chosen to participate in the pilot by letter. CDSS will submit an outline for the</u></p>	<p>Q3 Q4 <u>Q8</u></p>	<p><u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u></p>	<p>The Administration has proposed legislation suspending the pilot until there is funding. CDSS cannot continue with the pilot until that is resolved.</p> <p>2.7.2—pending--This action was due in Qrt 3 not Qrt 4. A change in the due date for this item was not renegotiated. ACF agreed to renegotiate this action and are looking for CDSS's proposed renegotiation for this action. (CBRO</p>

		<p><u>guidelines, plus a draft of one of the sections in the guidelines.</u></p>		<p>08/23/10)</p> <p>CDSS submitted a proposal to renegotiate (CBRO 10/1/10)</p> <p><i>In meeting with the state on 11/18/10 CDSS indicated that this action was delayed because they were delayed in getting funding to support it. Now that funding was awarding in this state budget they can move forward with notifying the counties and developing the workgroup.</i></p> <p><i>This action is still in renegotiation but the RO is expecting a proposed revised PIP that only modifies the quarter due to QRT 8 and the evidence of completion to include five letter notifying the counties of section, the document that lays out the framework of the pilot and what it is intending to achieve and a component of the counties implementation guideline. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>Approved 3/2010</p> <p>See request below 2/2011</p> <p>Copies of letters notifying the 5 selected counties that they were chosen to participate in the pilot, a copy of the outline of the guidelines and a draft of one</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>section of the guidelines are submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>State submitted copies of five letters notifying the counties of selection, a draft outline and a draft section of guidelines. The RO will follow-up with the state to clarify if the outline s still in draft or if it is now final. (CBRO 8/8/11)</u></p>
2.7.3—Implementation	CDSS-Sharon DeRige		Q8		<p>Contingent on funding. Changes identified in red text for this item are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>This action was proposed by the state and is not a part of the original PIP. CBRO is instructing that this action be deleted. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>Deleted per ACF instructions above.</p>
2.8 Implement Residentially Based Services Reform project in selected counties (Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Sacramento, and Bay Area Consortium).	CDSS (Karen Gunderson) and selected county partners and stakeholders.	Evidence of completion of step 2.8 (2.8.1 through 2.8.4).	Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u>	
2.8.1 County proposals submitted to CDSS.		Copies of two county proposals.	Q1	Done 11/30/09	<p>Four county RBS submissions have been received by CDSS and are currently under review. Proposal can be accessed via the link as evidence of completion. www.rbsreform.org</p> <p><i>The documents referenced above were not the proposals. The state has provided the proposals for two Counties: San Bernardino and Los</i></p>

					Angeles via the website CBRO 11/30/09
2.8.2 County proposals approved by CDSS.		Copies of two approval letters.	Q2 Q3	Done 05/27/10	<p>Quarter was changed from Q2 to reflect additional time needed to complete proposal approvals. One approval letter is being submitted for San Bernardino County. The other is forthcoming within the next week (L.A.).</p> <p>This action is pending the receipt of the approval letter to Los Angeles County. (CBRO 5/12/10)</p> <p>Los Angeles County approval letter was submitted on 5/25/10. NOTE: The RO will also appreciate copies of the executed MOU's (CBRO 5/27/10) Approved 3/2010</p>
2.8.3 Project implementation.		<p>Copy of evaluation report.</p> <p>Copy of at least one county annual report.</p>	Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u>	<p>The change identified in red text in the left column is a proposed revision.</p> <p><i>The CDSS is proposing a change because it indicates that counties implemented at various stages. This proposal is still in renegotiations but the RO would like to see all four annual reports, (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>Copy of a county's annual report submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>State submitted a RSB Annual Report for 2010 from San Bernardino County (CBRO 8/8/11)</u></p>

2.8.4	Workgroup convened to develop plan for transforming group home system.		One meeting agenda in which the transformation of the group homes system was discussed.	Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u>	<p>Copy of a meeting agenda in which the transformation of the group homes system was discussed is submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>CDSS submitted and agenda dated December 10, 2010, which identified that it was the 4th “strategic thinking” session to discuss congregate care. (CBRO 8/9/11)</u></p>
-------	--	--	---	----	--------------------------------	--

Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks – Submitted 1/29/2010

2.7.1	Select counties.		List of counties selected.	Q2 Q3		Quarter changed from Q2 to reflect additional time needed to complete selection of counties.
2.7.2	Convene workgroup to develop implementation requirements.		One meeting agenda which indicates the implementation requirements were discussed.	Q3 Q4		Quarter changed from Q3 to reflect additional time needed as documented in 2.7.1 above.
2.8.2	County proposals approved by CDSS.		Copies of two approval letters.	Q2 Q3		Quarter was changed from Q2 to reflect additional time needed to complete proposal approvals.

Renegotiation Action Steps and Benchmarks – Submitted 2/11/2011

2.4	<u>Utilize Caregiver the Quality Parenting Initiative (a collaborative project by Youth Law Center, California Department of Social Services and the California Welfare Director's Association) to</u>	CDSS (Karen Gunderson and Karen Grace-Kaho)	Evidence of completion of step 2.4 (2.4.1).	Q5 Q8		<u>CDSS determined that convening the Caregivers Advisory Group was redundant because the Ombudsman's Advisory Group has the same functions and already exists.</u>
-----	--	---	---	----------	--	---

identify and make recommendations related to reducing/removing barriers to permanence.					
2.4.1 Submit recommendation to CDSS management for consideration of implementation.		Copy of meeting agenda <u>in which the Quality Parenting Initiative's recommendations were discussed.</u>	Q5 Q8		<u>See 2.4.1 in matrix above.</u>
2.7.2 Convene workgroup to develop implementation requirements	CDSS (Karen Gunderson)	<u>CDSS will notify the five counties that were chosen to participate in the pilot by letter. CDSS will submit an outline for the guidelines, plus a draft of one of the sections in the guidelines.</u>	Q3 Q8		<u>The Administration had postponed the Resource Family Approval Pilot because there was no funding. However, in recent months funding has been approved through the Legislature, but the Executive Order for a hiring freeze prevents this position from being filled. Therefore, with existing resources CDSS will begin some of the work on program guidelines.</u> <u>See 2.7.2 in matrix above.</u>

Primary Strategy: 3. Enhance and expand caregiver recruitment, retention, training, and support efforts.		Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Well-Being Outcome 1, Case Review System , Training, Licensing, and Recruitment and Retention.			
Goal: Improve caregiver support strategies and augment educational/training curriculum.		Applicable CFSR Items: Items 17, 18, 29 , 34, 42, 44			
Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Status of EOC	Quarterly Update
3.1 CA Child Welfare Evidence Based Clearinghouse will:	CDSS-OCAP (Linne Stout)	Evidence of completion of step 3.1 (3.1.1 through 3.1.2).	Q3	Done 09/27/10	
3.1.1 Identify and publish information on resource family recruitment, retention, and training.		Copy of Clearinghouse web page with URL.	Q3	Done 06/21/10	Link to Clearinghouse web page and URL: http://www.cebc4cw.org/search/topical-area/23 Pending--While the webpage does have information available on recruiting and supporting

					<p>foster parents there is nothing in the information on the webpage that addresses retaining foster parents. The CDSS needs to clarify how they are addressing this since retaining foster parents was an issue in the CFSR. Pending further clarification from the CDSS (CBRO 051210)</p> <p>The State submitted a web-link that clarify the information related to the resource family recruitment, retention, and training. (CBRO 06/21/10)</p>
3.1.2 CA Evidence Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare will provide training on evidence based practices on resource families, recruitment, retention, training, and caregiver-social worker partnership.		Two training agendas from the Chadwick Center which indicate one or more of the evidence based practices were discussed.	Q3	Done 09/27/10	<p>Copies of two training agendas which indicate one or more evidence based practices were covered.</p> <p>Pending--The training agendas appear to be from two days during a conference. Nothing in the agendas that were submitted clarified that the subject matter was related to recruiting, retaining, and supporting foster parents. Pending clarification of training on the identified subject matter for this action. (CBRO 05/12/10)</p> <p>This action step is <i>still pending</i>. The state submitted the URL to information on practices related to resource family recruitment</p>

					<p>and retention of families (3.1.1) but did not provide evidence that the Clearinghouse provided the trainings on these practices as requested (still need to provide two training agendas to demonstrate the they have completed this action). (CBRO 07/28/10)</p> <p>State provided clarification on the URL and training that was provided to caregivers. We will accept even though this is training that was provided to caregivers and training about how to train caregivers or to recruit them etc (CBRO 09/27/10)</p>
<p>3.2 <u>Develop/initiate statewide campaign to recruit/retain resource families.—Develop and pilot to test strategies to recruit/retain resource families in conjunction with the Quality Parenting Initiative (a collaborative project by Youth Law Center, California Department of Social Services and the California Welfare Director’s Association).</u></p>	<p>CDSS (Karen Gunderson)</p>	<p>Evidence of completion of step 3.2 (3.2.1 through 3.2.7) <u>and Copies of the 5 counties’ action plans.</u></p>	<p>Q6 Q8</p>	<p>Done 09/19/11</p>	<p>Status: Undergoing renegotiations of 3.2 in Q4</p> <p>The CBRO is expecting the CDSS to submit a proposed renegotiation for the remaining action in 3.2. (CBRO 07/28/10)</p> <p>State submitted proposal to renegotiate (CBRO 10/1/10) Changes identified in red text in the left column are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>The CDSS is proposing to modify this action step to include 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.3.4 and possibly adding a 3.3.5 and 3.3.6. The RO is</i></p>

					<p><i>expecting the proposal to reflect providing that the CDSS will provide: the framework for the pilot that describes the hypothesis and strategies to be tested; the 5 counties action plans; the CDSS's monitoring county implementation process and tools to be used; share lessons learned among pilot counties; and the ACIN developed and issued regarding best practices to recruiting and retaining foster/adoptive parents learned from the pilot. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p><i>3.2 is undergoing renegotiation. See request below 2/2011</i></p>
3.2.1 Seek federal TA.		Copy of application for Federal TA.	Q1	Done 11/17/09	<p>The training and technical assistance request was submitted to the National Resource Center. The request is to improve recruitment, retention, and support of foster and adoptive families statewide. A copy of the application has been provided as evidence.</p> <p>State submitted the revised T&TA Request to the RO on 4/27/09, which was subsequently approved. (CBRO 11/17/09)</p>
3.2.2 Survey counties to identify promising practices at local level.		Copy of survey summary.	Q2	Done 02/28/11	<p>ACL ACIN and survey instrument provided pending survey summary report (report</p>

					<p>to be completed approx. by 01/31/10).</p> <p>In a phone call the State confirmed that they incorrectly identified that an ACL was provided as evidence of completion. CDSS should have correctly referenced an ACIN. The State submitted ACIN 1-36-09 dated 5/7/09 as evidence of completion, which satisfies this action step.</p> <p>This action step is pending as the Survey results do not clearly identify what the promising practices at the local level are. This information will have an affect on later actions steps as this strategy continues to be developed. CBRO has requested that a conference call be set up with the State staff to better understand the information submitted and how it will be used. (CBRO-030810)</p> <p>Pending—still not clear on the status of the statewide campaign to recruit/retain resource families and the evidence status for 3.2.2 concerning the identification of promising practices.(CBRO 5/27/10)</p> <p>Undergoing renegotiations of 3.2</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>in Q4</p> <p>3.2.2—pending--the state was to provide additional information about what it believes is promising practices. This was due following the Qrt 3 report. This action may also need to be included in the renegotiation that will address actions 3.2.2 and 3.2.4.(CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p>On 01/28/11 CDSS submitted a copy of a revised ACIN 08-11 that was issued to counties that identifies best practices, based on the survey of counties, for recruitment and retention of resource families. (02/28/11 CBRO)</p>
3.2.3 Develop campaigns with county partners. Develop pilot counties' action plans through the Quality Parenting Initiative.		Copies of two county campaign plans. Copy of action plans for each of the five counties.	Q4 <u>Q7</u>	Done 05/09/11	<p>County campaign work plans for San Luis Obispo, Ventura and Santa Clara submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>3.2.2 and 3.2.3—pending--the documents that were provided as evidence of completion are associated with the Youth Law Center pilot, which is currently not an approved part of the PIP. (CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p>

					<p>(See CBRO comment in 3.2 12/08/10)</p> <p>3.2 is undergoing renegotiation. See request below 2/2011</p> <p><u>Copy of action plans for each of the five counties submitted as evidence of completion.</u></p> <p>On 5/2/11 the CDSS provided County Plans for 5 counties—San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, Humboldt; Nevada, and Ventura to implement the Quality Parenting Initiative. (CBRO 05/09/11)</p>
3.2.4 Launch campaign. Conduct site visits to selected counties to assess effective implementation of plans.		Examples of campaign materials produced. Copy of Assessment tool used to assess effective implementation.	Q7	Done 05/09/11	<p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p>(See CBRO comment in 3.2 12/08/10)</p> <p>3.2 is undergoing renegotiation. See request below 2/2011</p> <p><u>Copy of assessment tool submitted as evidence of completion.</u></p> <p>On 5/2/11 the CDSS provided a copy of the assessment tool that contains a series of questions; however, it does not provide information on how the assessment tool is to</p>

					<p>be used. ACF will accept the document as evidence of completion but would like to further understand how the document is used and whether it also assesses for effectiveness by looking at the achievement of the project's overall goals. (CBRO 05/09/11)</p>
3.2.5	<p><u>Regional convening's to showcase best practices from pilot counties. Utilize the Quality Parenting Initiative to assist in program evaluation, review best practices and develop county convening's.</u></p>		<p><u>Copy of "Save the Date" announcement to guest counties and minutes from one Quality Parenting Initiative meeting.</u></p>	<p>Q6 Q8</p>	<p>Done 09/09/11</p> <p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p>(See CBRO comment in 3.2 12/08/10) 3.2 is undergoing renegotiation. See request below 2/2011</p> <p><u>Copy of "Save the Date" announcement from Quality Parenting Initiative submitted as evidence of completion.</u></p> <p>The State submitted ACIN 1-16-11, which includes the announcement of dates for counties that are interested in learning more about the QPI. For this action to be completed the CDSS still needs to submit an agenda from a QPI meeting. (CBRO 05/09/11)</p> <p>A copy of "Save the Date" announcement to guest counties and minutes from one</p>

					<p>QPI meeting submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>Pending --CDSS re-submitted ACIN 16-11, which includes an announcement for meeting dates for counties interested in learning more about QPI. The state still needs to provide minutes from a QPI meeting (CBRO 8/9/11)</u></p> <p><u>On 9/9/11 the CDSS provided a meeting agenda , rather than minutes as evidence of completing this action step. The CDSS indicated that meeting notes were not available. Based on the August 23 conference call with the CDSS and YLC about the content of the meetings the ACF will accept the agenda as documentation for completing this action step. (CBRO 09/19/11)</u></p>
<u>3.2.6</u>	<u>Develop department recruitment and retention external webpage to link counties to pilot counties' action plans, as well as other related activities and reports associated with this pilot.</u>		<u>Copy of URL.</u>	<u>Q8</u>	<p><u>Done 08/15/11</u></p> <p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions. <i>(See CBRO comment in 3.2 12/08/10)</i> <i>3.2 is undergoing renegotiation.</i> <i>See request below 2/2011</i></p> <p>URL below is submitted as evidence of completion.</p>

					http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG2684.htm <u>CDSS has provided the link to the Foster parent recruitment and retention website that includes a link to Florida's QPI website and the California Counties Action Plans. (CBRO 8/15/11)</u>
3.2.7	<u>Draft Outcomes Summary of lessons learned/best practices from the pilot.</u>		<u>Copy of initial draft Outcomes Summary Report.</u>	<u>Q8</u> Done 09/19/11	<p>See request below 2/2011</p> <p>Copy of initial "draft" Outcomes Summary Report submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>Pending --CDSS submitted a report entitled Quality Parenting Initiative Recommendation Summary dated June 30, 2011. However ACF is unable to determine what the recommendations are as they relate to recruiting and retaining families. ACF has requested a meeting with QPI leads to better understand this project and what the recommendation as well as lessons learned to date (CBRO 08/8/11)</u></p> <p><u>On August 23, 2011, the CDSS and YLC participated in a conference call with the CBRO</u></p>

					<p><u>to help the RO better understand how the QPI is being implemented. In addition, the RO learned that the program is still being rolled out and that the lessons learned are continual. The YLC representative reference the report from the project in Florida.</u></p> <p><u>Because the draft report that CDSS was in draft (but the RO was unable to determine exactly what the recommendation were) the RO strongly urged the CDSS to revise the draft to be more comprehensible.</u></p> <p><u>On 09/15/11 the RO learned from the CDSS that they will not be modifying the draft but will make changes in the final report. (CBRO 09/19/11)</u></p>
3.3 Form state level Caregiver Advisory Group including youth, to develop statewide agenda for recruitment, training, support and retention.	CDSS (Karen Gunderson)	Evidence of completion of step 3.3 (3.3.1 through 3.3.3).	Q6 Q7	Done 09/19/11	<p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>This action step is still in negotiation; however, CBRO is suggesting that this activity be included in another related statewide workgroup. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p>

3.3.1	Announce formation of advisory group and application for membership process; select members.		Copy of advisory group announcement.	Q2		(See CBRO comment in 3.3 12/08/10) Approved 3/2010
3.3.2	Convene group.		Copies of two advisory group agendas. Copies of two <u>Quality Parenting Initiative</u> meeting agendas indicating recruitment and retention were discussed.	Q4 <u>Q7</u>	<u>08/15/11</u>	<p>Two agendas submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>3.3.2—pending--The documents provided as evidence of completion for this action is related to the Youth Law Center Pilot, which is not approved as part of the PIP. The action should be included in the discussion and consideration for renegotiation if the state will propose including the Youth Law center Project as part of the PIP. (CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p>(See CBRO comment in 3.3 12/08/10) Approved 3/2010</p> <p><u>Copies of two Quality Parenting Initiative meeting agendas submitted as evidence of completion.</u></p> <p>The documents the were submitted as evidence of completion where two agendas</p>

					<p>from the Caregiver Advocacy network annual meeting. The state will need to provide information to show how this group links with QPI, since ACF was expecting to receive agenda from the QPI group that documents that recruitment and retention were discussed. (CBRO 05/09/11)</p> <p>Copies of two QPI meeting agendas indicating recruitment and retention were discussed. One agenda (Feb 24th) has accompanying notes that cover the topic in depth.</p> <p><u>CDSS submitted two agendas dates 2/24/11 and 1/31/11 but it is difficult to determine what about recruitment and retention was discussed. ACF has requested a meeting to better understand this program and what is happening as it relates to this action step (CBRO 8/9/11)</u></p> <p><u>During a conference call with YLC and CDSS to better understand the QPI and determine whether the agenda that was submitted met the requirement of the PIP, the ACF learned that recommendations and lesson</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p><u>learned are always apart of the agenda for this program. According to Carole Shauffer, this is the opportunity for participating counties to share their lessons learned with other counties and to make recommendations about what is and/or is not working as they are rolling out the Initiative. Based on this clarification (08/15/11) the CBRO will accept the Agenda that was submitted by CDSS (CBRO 09/06/11)</u></p>
3.3.3 CDSS considers recommendations for implementation.		Copy of <u>Youth Law Center (QPI)</u> group's recommendation summary to Deputy Director.	Q6 Q7	Done 09/19/11	<p>State submitted proposal to renegotiate (CBRO 10/1/10)</p> <p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p>(See CBRO comment in 3.3 12/08/10)</p> <p>3.3.3 Deleted</p> <p>There was no documentation provided for this action step. The state will need to provide its evidence of completion. (CBRO 05/09/11)</p> <p>Copy of Youth Law Center (QPI) group's recommendation summary to Deputy Director submitted in Q8 due to</p>

					<p>confusion surrounding the status of the item's continued necessity/deletion of step question.</p> <p><u>Pending --CDSS submitted a report entitled Quality Parenting Initiative Recommendation Summary dated June 30, 2011. However ACF is unable to determine what the recommendations are as they relate to recruiting and retaining families. ACF has requested a meeting with QPI leads to better understand this project and what the recommendation as well as lessons learned to date (CBRO 08/8/11)</u></p> <p><u>Please see CBRO comments in 3.2.5 (CBRO 09/19/11)</u></p>
<p>3.4 Develop program outcomes, rate structure, and oversight policies and procedures for MTFC.</p>	<p>CDSS (Barbara Eaton)</p>	<p>Evidence of completion of step 3.4 (3.4.1 through 3.4.2).</p>	<p><u>Q8</u></p>	<p><u>Done 08/09/11</u></p>	<p>State submitted proposal to renegotiate (CBRO 10/1/10) Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>This proposed renegotiation is still in process for consideration. In a meeting with the state on 12/07/10 they informed the RO that they would not be able to meet this action step by the eight quarter because the action is</i></p>

					<p><i>apart of a larger process involving group home care.</i></p> <p><i>They are currently in the process of putting together a workgroup and that the workgroup would not have completed it process before the end of the PIP. (CBRO 12/09/10)</i></p> <p>See request below 2/2011</p>
<p>3.4.1 Support implementation and use of MTFC. The state will form a workgroup to address rate structure, policies, and procedures for MTFC.</p>		<p>Copies of materials developed for 3.4 and implementation plan. <u>The evidence of completion will be a copy of an agenda that demonstrates that a meeting was held for this purpose.</u></p>	<u>Q8</u>	<p><u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u></p>	<p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>(See CBRO comment in 3.4 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>See request below 2/2011</p> <p>Copy of one agenda that indicates that MTFC's rate structure, policies, and procedures were addressed is submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>CDSS submitted a copy of an agenda and summary of the series of meetings that have been held for this purpose. (CBRO 08/9/11)</u></p>
<p>3.4.2 Increase number of MTFC programs</p>		<p>PIP quarterly report with total number of new MTFC programs.</p>	<u>Q8</u>		<p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>(See CBRO comment in 3.4 12/08/10)</i></p>

					See request below 2/2011
3.5 Test "Better Together" model to facilitate collaboration between caregivers and social workers in five counties.	CDSS (Karen Gunderson and Linne Stout)	Evidence of completion of step 3.5 (3.5.1 through 3.5.2).	Q8		<p>State submitted proposal to renegotiate (CBRO 10/1/10)</p> <p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>This action step is still being considered for renegotiation. In a meeting on 11/18/10 the CDSS indicated that elements of this model are included in the youth Law Center recruitment and retention project. The state needs to provide information to the RO that indicates the elements of the "Better Together" model and demonstrates how they are included in the Youth Law Center recruitment and retention model. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>See request below 2/2011</p>
3.5.1 Workshops initiated.		Copies of two workshop agendas.	Q5		<p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>(See CBRO comment in 3.5 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>See request below 2/2011</p>
3.5.2 Use lessons learned to determine feasibility of expanding utilization of model.		Feasibility summary to caregiver advisory group.	Q8		<p>Changes identified in red text in the left columns are proposed revisions.</p> <p><i>(See CBRO comment in 3.5</i></p>

					12/08/10) See request below 2/2011
3.6 Establish a communication network for caregiver advocates.	CDSS-FCO (Karen Grace-Kaho)	Evidence of completion of step 3.6 (3.6.1 through 3.6.3).	Q4	Done 2/28/11	
3.6.1 Identify advocacy organizations for caregivers and create directory by county.		Copy of advocacy directory.	Q1	Done 11/17/09	A directory of advocacy organizations has been completed. A copy of the directory has been submitted as evidence of completion. We note that not all CA counties are represented and suggest that the state implement a plan to update the directory periodically as needed. (CBRO 11/17/09)
3.6.2 Convene annual meeting of key caregiver advocacy organizations to exchange information.		Copy of meeting agenda.	Q4	Done 08/23/10	A copy of the annual key caregiver advocacy organizations information exchange agenda.
3.6.3 Share information via caregiver network email list to disseminate information.		Copy of caregiver dissemination list.	Q2	Done 02/24/10	Information is now provided regularly to those on the caregiver list. A copy of one item distributed along with the list of recipients has been submitted as evidence of completion.
3.6.4 Explore funding streams to support caregiver advocacy and implement depending on availability of funds.		Copy of funding summary and draft implementation plan.	Q5 Q7	Done 02/28/11	Due to the Delay in the approval of the California State Budget, CDSS was unable to verify the availability of funds. Several possibilities for funding will continue to be explored within

				<p>CDSS. Initial discussions have occurred exploring the possibility of utilizing training funds to train the caregiver advocates on effective advocacy skills and overview of the child welfare system. Current discussions include utilizing AB2129 funding to hold Regional Training Forums on the lessons learned from the CDSS/YLC Recruitment & Retention Pilots (Quality Parenting Initiative). At the Regional Training Forums both advocates and county social workers will be trained on the importance of effective advocacy to retain quality foster families. A meeting of the Caregiver Advocacy Network will be held in the first week of December to begin the planning of the Regional Training Forums (meetings were internal with CDSS staff and no official agenda or minutes were appropriate).</p> <p><i>This action required the state to “explore funding streams to support caregiver advocacy and implement depending on availability of funds.” The CDSS need to provide documentation to show what funding streams were explored. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>On 2/24/11 CDSS submitted a document that provides a summary of the funding streams that were explored to support this action. As noted in the document, no funds were available but CDSS is now assessing county models and funds for this purpose. (CBRO 02/28/11)</p> <p>No funding streams were available to support the caregiver advocacy project. CDSS will indicate to ACF via a letter which philanthropic organizations were explored for funding</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks – Submitted 1/29/2010

3.1.2	CA Evidence Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare will provide training on evidence based practices on resource families, recruitment, retention, training, and caregiver-social worker partnership.		Two training agendas from the Chadwick Center which indicate one or more of the evidence based practices were discussed.	Q3		3.1.2 Updated to indicate the training agendas are from the Chadwick Center, who run the Evidence Based Clearinghouse.
3.3	Was changed to read as follows: Utilize the State level Foster Care Recruitment and Retention Project comprised of caregivers, youth and various stakeholders to address caregiver recruitment, retention,					

support and training.					
3.3.1 Announce formation of advisory group and application for membership process; select members.		Copy of advisory group announcement.	Q2		3.3.1 Eliminated to reflect that the Foster Care Recruitment and Retention Project has existing members that include caregivers, youth, and various stakeholders and therefore no application and selection of members will occur.
3.3.2 Was changed to reflect that the Foster Care Recruitment and Retention...would provide the evidence of completion.		Copies of two agendas from the foster Care Recruitment and Retention Project			
3.3.3 Was changed to reflect that the Foster Care Recruitment and Retention...would provide the evidence of completion.		Copy of foster care recruitment and Retention Project recommendation summary to the Deputy Director	Q6 Q7		See 3.3.3 in matrix above.

Renegotiation Action Steps and Benchmarks – Submitted 2/11/2011

3.2 Develop/initiate statewide campaign to recruit/retain resource families. <u>Develop a pilot to test strategies to recruit/retain resource families in conjunction with the Quality Parenting Initiative (a collaborative project by Youth Law Center, California Department of Social</u>	CDSS (Karen Gunderson)	Evidence of completion of step 3.2 (3.2.1 through 3.2.7). <u>Copies of the 5 counties action plans.</u>	Q6 <u>Q8</u>		CDSS is proposing to modify all of 3.2 because it has determined that by first conducting a pilot, strategies can be tested and refined before they are shared statewide. The results from the pilot will allow CDSS to be better informed about successful recruitment and retention strategies of resource families. Elements of this revision will
---	------------------------	--	-----------------	--	---

<u>Services and the California Welfare Director's Association).</u>					include providing ACF with: 5 counties action plans; CDSS's will also develop a procedure to evaluate the lessons learned, i.e., what worked, what didn't work and write a review summary that it will share with all counties via URL and provide a draft lessons learned summary of its review of the pilot (summary will be a compilation of all 5 counties findings). See 3.2 in matrix above.
3.2.3 Develop campaigns with county partners pilot counties' action plans through the Quality Parenting Initiative.		Copies of two county campaign plans. Copy of actions plans for each of the five counties.	Q4 Q7		See 3.2.
3.2.4 Launch campaign. Conduct site visits to selected counties to assess effective implementation of plans.		Copy of Assessment tool used to assess effective implementation.	Q7		See 3.2
3.2.5 <u>Regional convening's to showcase best practices from pilot counties that could be utilized in other counties. Utilize the Quality Parenting Initiative to assist in program</u>		<u>Examples of campaign materials produced. Copy of "Save the Date" announcement to</u>	<u>Q6 Q8</u>		See 3.2 See 3.2.5 in matrix above.

<u>evaluation, review best practices and develop county convening's.</u>		<u>guest counties and minutes from one Quality Parenting Initiative meeting.</u>			
3.2.6 <u>Develop department recruitment and retention external webpage to link counties to pilot counties action plans, as well as other related activities and reports associated with this pilot.</u>		<u>Copy of URL.</u>	<u>Q8</u>		This action step was added to reflect ongoing progress towards impacting recruitment and retention. See 3.2.6 in matrix above.
3.2.7 <u>Draft outcomes summary of lessons learned/best practices from the pilot.</u>		<u>Copy of initial draft outcomes summary.</u>	<u>Q8</u>		This is a new action step added to reflect ongoing progress towards impacting recruitment and retention. See 3.2.7 in matrix above.
3.3 Utilize the State-level Foster Care Recruitment and Retention Project <u>Quality Parenting Initiative</u> comprised of caregivers, youth and various stakeholders to address caregiver recruitment, retention, support and training.	CDSS (Karen Gunderson and Karen Grace-Kaho)		<u>Q6</u> <u>Q7</u>		
3.4 Develop program outcomes, rate structure, and oversight policies and procedures for MTFC.	CDSS (Barbara Eaton)	Evidence of completion of step 3.4 (3.4.1 through 3.4.2).	<u>Q8</u>		CDSS is requesting to renegotiate this step to remove the outcomes and oversight portions because there was a one year delay in starting this project largely due to

					redirection of resources. The ITFC/MTFC workgroup meets monthly. Due to the high level of stakeholder interest and involvement and the need to collect cost data not previously available, the new rate will not be finalized until 12/11 or later.
3.4.1 Support implementation and use of MTFC. <u>The state will form a workgroup to address rate structure, policies, and procedures for MTFC.</u>		<u>Copies of materials developed for 3.4 and implementation plan. The evidence of completion will be a copy of an agenda that demonstrates that a meeting was held for this purpose.</u>	<u>Q8</u>		CDSS will continue to report out on this in the APSR (see explanation for change in 3.4 above). See 3.4.1 in matrix above.
3.4.2 Increase number of MTFC programs		PIP quarterly report with total number of new MTFC programs.	Q8		CDSS requests this item be eliminated because it was predicated on a new rate being available for MTFC which would support the growth of MTFC programs. This rate will not be available until at least 12/11.
3.5 Test "Better Together" model to facilitate collaboration between caregivers and social workers in five counties.	CDSS (Karen Gunderson and Linne Stout)	Evidence of completion of step 3.5 (3.5.1 through 3.5.2). List of elements to be captured in 3.2	Q8		CDSS has determined that this step is better aligned with the Youth Law Center Recruitment and Retention Pilot in 3.2. A list of elements of this model will be included as evidence of completion. Elements of Better Together captured in 3.2 below...

					<p>A). Quality Parenting Initiative (QPI) facilitates/develops partnerships that are beneficial to Child Welfare Services involved individuals (social workers, staff, foster parents, bio-parents, and foster youth). B). CDSS/counties work as a team to develop modifications to processes that will benefit recruitment, training and retention of caregiver parents. C). CDSS and QPI continue partnership with counties by holding regularly scheduled meetings to discuss issues that are important to foster parents, bio-parents and foster youth.</p>
3.6.4 Explore funding streams to support caregiver advocacy and implement depending on availability of funds.		<p>Copy of funding summary and draft implementation plan. Copy of philanthropic organizations explored for funding.</p>	<p>Q5 Q7</p>		<p>No funding available, therefore implementation plan not developed.</p>

Primary Strategy: 4. Expand options and create flexibility for services and supports to meet the needs of children and families.		Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Safety Outcome 2, Well-Being Outcomes 4, 2 and 3, and Service Array.			
Goal: Increase statewide access to varied existing services options for children/youth, and families in foster care.		Applicable CFSR Items: Items 3, 4, 17 , 21, 23, 35, 36, 37, 40			
Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Status of EOC	Quarterly Update
4.1 Linkages Project utilized to disseminate best practices on effective collaboration between CalWORKS and Child Welfare regarding services and supports for families.	CDSS-OCAP (Linne Stout) CFPIC (Danna Fabella)	Evidence of completion of step 4.1 (4.1.1 through 4.1.3).	Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/25/11</u>	
4.1.1 Utilize semi-annual project meetings to inform participants of best practices.		Copy of two meeting agendas.	Q6	Done 05/12/10	Copies of two meeting agendas that indicate best practices were discussed.
4.1.2 Disseminate screening tools and associated protocols.		Screening tools and associated protocols.	Q4	Done 05/12/10	Copies of Screening tools and associated protocols.
4.1.3 Analyze annual reports to determine level of county implementation.		Annual Report	Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/25/11</u>	Copy of Annual Report submitted as evidence of completion. <u>CDSS was to submit a report that shows county level implementing of Linkages. However, the CDSS submitted a report that appears to have been prepared for ACF. CDSS needs to submit a copy of the annual report as outlined in the</u>

					<p><u>PIP. (CBRO 8/9/11)</u></p> <p><u>On 08/16/11 the CBRO learned that the quarterly report that was submitted was a copy of the quarterly report that is required as part of the discretionary grant funding from ACF. The CBRO agreed to accept the quarterly report update and a copy of the previous annual report to satisfy this requirement. The previous report for the period 2009-2010 was provided to the RO on 08/25/11). The current report is in draft and will be completed in September 2011. (CBRO 09/06/11)</u></p>
4.2 Implement integration of OCAP's 3-year plan into Outcomes and Accountability System to strengthen service continuum through collaboration with community based service providers including informal supports.	CDSS (Linne Stout and Richard Smith)	Evidence of completion of step 4.2 (4.2.1 through 4.2.2).	Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u>	
4.2.1 Finalize CSA and SIP guidelines to provide guidance to counties.		Copy of issued All County Information Notice releasing CSA and SIP guidelines.	Q1	Done 11/17/09	The ACIN (I-53-09) on CSA and SIP guidelines was issued August 2009. A copy of the ACIN has been provided as evidence of completion.
4.2.2 Implement integration with 25 counties.		County SIPs posted online.	Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u>	<p>List of counties and URL of SIPs posted online submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>CDSS provided the URL and a</u></p>

					<u>list of counties with the integrated OCAP plan. It should be noted that some of these date back as far as 2009. (CBRO 08/9/11)</u>
4.3	Expand the Wraparound program and consequently increase the number of families receiving wraparound services.	CDSS (Linne Stout)	Evidence of completion of step 4.3 (4.3.1 through 4.3.4).	Q8	Done 12/08/10
4.3.1	Provide technical assistance (TA) to non-wraparound counties to help assess their feasibility to implement wraparound.		Site visit reports including # of TA days.	Q1	Done 12/7/09 Technical assistance (TA) was provided using a variety of methods to Mariposa, Sonoma, & Stanislaus Counties (all non-Wraparound counties). CDSS approved Mariposa County's implementation plan on July 15, 2009. Implementation plans for Sonoma & Stanislaus Counties are under review. In addition to the initial documents the state submitted more documents to clarify exactly what kind of TA was being provided to the counties. CDSS staff reports because of the nature of TA it is difficult to track all TA specifically. (CBRO 12/7/09)
4.3.2	Provide training and technical assistance to enable current wraparound counties to build capacity to serve more children.		Site visit reports including # of T/TA days delivered to one wrap county.	Q1	Done 12/7/09 TA provided to current Wraparound counties. Addressed implementation and administration of Wraparound Services Programs, including strategies to build capacity. Staff conducted eight days of face-to-face TA for 20 counties.

					The face-to-face is a combination of regional convening and in-county meetings. In addition, approximately 290 hours of TA was delivered via one-on-one phone calls, conference calls, and e-mails.
4.3.3	Establish baseline measure of number of wraparound “slots”.		Revised PIP with baseline.	Q1	Done 11/30/09 Item completed during PIP approval process. See Part B.
4.3.4	Increase number of capacity for wraparound services.		Quarterly report with data on capacity increase.	Q8	Done 12/08/10 Covered in Item 17 of measurements section (B. Item-Specific and Quantitative Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report). The CBRO is considering that this action step was met at the time the CDSS achieved the data measure for Item 17. (CBRO 12/08/10)
4.4	Utilize the State Interagency Team (SIT) to strengthen service array options by developing State level interdepartmental strategies that reduce barriers and increase interagency collaboration. Priority areas include mental health, substance abuse, and education. <u>Coordinate with the SIT to expand substance abuse treatment services.</u>	CDSS (<u>Dave McDowell</u>)	Two copies of SIT meeting agendas and current work plan. <u>Minutes of meeting indicating CDSS’ participation on SIT for Q7</u>	Q1, <u>Q7</u> and Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/23/11</u> The State Interagency Team’s most recent meetings occurred in August and September 2009. The strategic plan was updated June 2009. A copy of the meeting notes with embedded agenda and current work plan have been provided as evidence of completion. The state provided meeting minutes from 8/4/09 and 9/25/09. However, in minutes from 9/25/09 does not provide information regarding either of the priority

					<p>areas in the PIP. The state should provide an additional set of minutes that contains information on these priorities. (CBRO 11/17/09)</p> <p>The RO clarified with the State clarified that the meeting agenda and work plan was submitted for this action. There will be another agenda and minutes provided in quarter 8.</p> <p>There was no evidence of completion provided for this action step. In addition, the ACF believe that the only modification to this action should have been that the meeting minutes come from the SIT committee because they now include this as one of their focuses. The minutes should be due in QRT 8 (CBRO 05/09/11)</p> <p>In a conference call meeting with CDSS on it was clarified that there was a typo in the OC column and that the due date for the 2nd document is due in QRT 8 (CBRO on 05/23/11)</p> <p>On 05/12/11 the CDSS submitted meeting minutes from the SIT that provided a report out from Greg about the status of the substance abuse</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>treatment accessibility work. The document was submitted in draft form. Once the minutes have been final, it will suffice for 4.4 and 4.5 (CBRO 05/26/11)</p> <p>Copy of “final” meeting minutes indicating CDSS’ participation on SIT is submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p><u>Pending -- CDSS submitted draft meeting minutes dated June 17, 2011. As indicated in the previous comments the CDSS needs to submit the final approved minutes from the draft minutes that were previously sent in with the Quarter 7 report. (CBRO 08/9/11)</u></p> <p><u>On August 23, 2011 the CDSS submitted the final (approved) minutes from the April 22, 2011 meeting as was required (CBRO 08/23/11)</u></p>
4.5	Coordinate with Child Welfare Council (CWC) and SIT to expand substance abuse treatment services.	CDSS(<u>Dave McDowell</u>)	Minutes of meeting indicating CDSS’ participation on CWC and CWC committees Q1 and <u>Minutes of meeting with SIT for Q7</u>	Q1 and Q6 <u>Q7</u>	<p><u>Done 08/23/11</u></p> <p>The Child Welfare Council’s most recent meeting occurred September 2009. A copy of the agenda and executive summary are provided as evidence of completion.</p> <p>The state provides an agenda</p>

					<p>from a meeting held on September 17, 2009 but does not provide the meeting minutes from this meeting. Please provide. (CBRO 11/17/09)</p> <p>The State clarified a meeting summary document contains a summary of the CWC meeting.</p> <p><i>In a meeting with CDSS staff on 12/07/10, they have informed CB that they would like to revise this action to be continued by the SIT committee as the CWC no longer has this as a focus so they will not be able to achieve this action as is.(CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>See request below 2/2011</p> <p>The CDSS submitted a memo to the SIT Team from Dept. of Drug and Alcohol which “summaries and seeks endorsement of the committee recommendation for future work on Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (FASD) issues the State...” The ACF is not clear how the memo and the work intends to get at expanded drug and alcohol services as was the intent of the action step. (CBRO 05/09/11)</p> <p>On 05/12/11 the CDSS</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>submitted meeting minutes from the SIT that provided a report out from Greg about the status of the substance abuse treatment accessibility work. The document was submitted in draft form. Once the minutes have been final, it will suffice for 4.4 and 4.5 (CBRO 05/26/11)</p> <p>See 4.4 above.</p> <p><u>Pending -- CDSS submitted draft meeting minutes dated June 17, 2011. As indicated in the previous comments the CDSS needs to submit the final approved minutes from the draft minutes that were previously sent in with the Quarter 7 report. (CBRO 08/9/11)</u></p> <p><u>On August 23, 2011 the CDSS submitted the final (approved) minutes from the April 22, 2011 meeting as was required (CBRO 08/23/11)</u></p>
4.6	Monitor and provide technical assistance for IV-E Waiver Demonstration Project (L.A. and Alameda Counties) to determine impact of waiver on service array.	CDSS (Linne Stout)	Evidence of completion of step 4.6 (4.6.1).	Q4	<p>Done 12/08/10</p>

4.6.1	Support funding flexibility efforts to expand/enhance services and supports to meet children/family needs.		Two county summaries of IV-E Waiver TA provided.	Q4	Done 12/08/10	<p>Copies of two county IV-E Waiver Summaries of TA submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>4.6.1—pending-- The State provided two agenda's for meetings but is not clear what T&TA the CDSS provided to the counties. One of the meetings appears to be an agenda from a National Meeting sponsored by ACF and is not acceptable. State needs to provide additional/clarifying document to show what assistance CDSS has provided these counties. (CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p><i>On 10/12/10 the CDSS provided additional information that clarified the kind of TA it provided to the Waiver Counties. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p>
4.7	Establish workgroup to determine feasibility of statewide implementation of Differential Response (DR).	CDSS (Linne Stout)	Evidence of completion of step 4.7 (4.7.1 through 4.7.3).	Q6	Done 05/9/11	
4.7.1	Finalize DR model and parameters for model fidelity in rollout.		Workgroup recommendations to Deputy Director.	Q4	Done 12/08/10	<p>Copy of document indicating workgroup recommendations to Deputy Director.</p> <p>4.7.1—pending--The action required the state to provide a DR model and the parameters for model fidelity in rollout. These were to be recommendations that</p>

					<p>were submitted to the deputy. What was submitted seems to be the finished DR roll-out. The CDSS need to clarify how the document that was submitted differs from what we should be expecting in 4.7.2 and 4.7.3. Do these item need to be renegotiated? (CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p><i>On 10/12/10 the CDSS clarified that that the action step 4.7.2 is related to researching funding and other support for counties. Action 4.7.3 is related to a plan to implement DR statewide. They are on target to achieving these actions. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p>
4.7.2 Research and identify state and federal options that support DR.		Summary of options to Deputy Director.	Q6	<p>Done 05/9/11</p>	<p>Copy of summary to Deputy Director submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>Pending--CDSS submitted a copy of a memo to the Deputy; however, we are unclear about what the state and Federal options are for supporting the implementation of DR. The RO has asked for a conference call with the leads for the project to better understand the information that was provided. (CBRO 02/28/11)</p> <p><u>Clarification to satisfy 4.7.2 and 4.7.3 sent to RO w/Q7 report</u></p>

					<p><u>(conference call with RO and Joyce Dowell held per RO's request).</u></p> <p>The CDSS submitted additional information to clarify the results of the research (CBRO 05/09/11)</p>
4.7.3 Develop a plan for statewide implementation .		Copy of implementation plan.	Q6	Done 05/9/11	<p>Copy of implementation plan submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>Pending—CDSS submitted a document that is identified as the CDSS DR Implementation Plan; however, the RO has requested a conference call to better understand the implementation and the document that was provided. (CBRO 02/28/11)</p> <p><u>Clarification to satisfy 4.7.2 and 4.7.3 sent to RO w/Q7 report (conference call with RO and Joyce Dowell held per RO's request).</u></p> <p>The CDSS submitted additional information to clarify the state's implementation plan (CBRO 05/09/11)</p>
4.8 Collaborative proposal submitted for in-depth TA from the National Center for Substance Abuse and Child Welfare.	ADP (Peggy Bean), CDSS (Karen Gunderson), AOC (Jennifer	Copy of submitted proposal.	Q1	Done 11/17/09	<p>The request for In-Depth Technical Assistance Site Application to the National Center on Substance Abuse and Child Welfare has been</p>

	Walter)				submitted and approved. A copy of the application has been provided as evidence.
4.9 Disseminate information to counties about utilizing the AOC's clearinghouse of culturally appropriate services for Indian children/families as a resource.	AOC (Jennifer Walter)	Two announcements to all counties indicating availability of AOC resource for culturally appropriate services.	Q6	Done 05/09/11	<p>A website address and email indicating availability of AOC resource for culturally appropriate services submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>Pending—CDSS provided a copy of the website indicating that the clearing house is available; however, CDSS should provide information about how the counties were informed that the clearinghouse is available. (CBRO 2/28/11)</p> <p>The CDSS submitted a copy of an e-mail that was sent out April 19, 2011 an April 21, 2011 indicating that the website is available (CBRO 05/09/11)</p>
Renegotiation Action Steps and Benchmarks – Submitted <u>2/11/2011</u>					
4.4 Utilize the State Interagency Team (SIT) to strengthen service array options by developing State level interdepartmental strategies that reduce barriers and increase interagency collaboration. Priority areas include mental health, substance abuse, and education.	CDSS (Dave McDowell)	Two copies of SIT meeting agendas and current work plan. <u>Minutes of meeting</u>	Q1, <u>Q7</u> and Q8		<p>See explanation for change below in 4.5.</p> <p>See 4.4 in matrix.</p>

<u>Coordinate with the SIT to expand substance abuse treatment services.</u>		<u>indicating CDSS' participation on SIT for Q7</u>			
4.5 Coordinate with Child Welfare Council (CWC) <u>and Systems Improvement Team (SIT)</u> to expand substance abuse treatment services.	CDSS (<u>Dave McDowell</u>)	Minutes of meeting indicating CDSS' participation on CWC and, CWC Q1 and <u>Minutes of meeting with SIT for Q7</u>	Q1 and Q6 <u>Q7</u>		The CWC has undergone a focus change to "Out of County Mental Health" as a result of legislative attention, therefore, the SIT committee will be working on the issue to expand substance abuse services for the Q7 submission.

Primary Strategy: 5. Sustain and expand staff/supervisor training.		Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Training			
Goal: Increase educational and training opportunities for staff and supervisors working in the child welfare system.		Applicable CFSR Items: Items 32, 33			
Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Status of EOC	Quarterly Update

5.1	Enhance training for probation staff.	CDSS (Linne Stout)	Evidence of completion of step 5.1 (5.1.1 through 5.1.4).	Q4	Done 05/09/11	
5.1.1	Collaborate with CPOC to survey county probation departments to assess training needs.	CPOC (Karen Pank)	Survey Results	Q1	Done 11/24/09	<p>A needs assessment survey was conducted in 2007. The survey findings are included in the Chief Probation Officers of California Training Plan 2008/2009. A copy of the plan has been provided as evidence.</p> <p>The state provided the list of 148 training topic that resulted in the training needs survey of probation officers. This was the only document that was available as a result of the survey that was conducted in 2007. State must provide this. (CBRO 11/17/09)</p>
5.1.2	Develop three new child welfare related curriculum for probation specific needs; deliver training.		Table of contents of new curriculum or one training agenda.	Q3	Done 05/12/10	Copy of one new child welfare curriculum training agenda for probation.
5.1.3	Increase awareness of the availability of nine day probation officer core training.		One copy of training announcement.	Q4	Done 05/12/10	Copy of one training announcement re: nine day probation officer core training.
5.1.4	Increase awareness of availability of two-day mandated training for probation officers on TPR, concurrent planning and visitation.		One copy of training announcement.	Q4	Done 05/09/11	<p>Copy of training announcement submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>5.1.4—pending--The documents that were submitted as evidence of completion are the class syllabi only. The CDSS needs to provide information with the dates and times that these trainings were</p>

					<p>made available as per the PIP. (CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p><i>Still pending</i> --the state provided an excel spreadsheet that includes the names of probation officers who attended training on August 19 and 20 (youth in placement: safety, services, and supervision), which comports with the title of the curriculum. However, the participants are all from LA County. We are not sure how many other county probation officers were aware of the opportunity to participate. Please provide some kind of documentation to show how awareness (more broadly) about the training was made. (CBRO 09/21/10)</p> <p>Sent email regarding this item on 3/23/2011 indicating that a training announcement was forwarded to DS on 12/27/2010. She acknowledged that the document had been received and that this Action Item is now considered complete.</p> <p>CBRO concurs with CDSS notes above. (CBRO 05/05/11)</p>
5.2 Implement new social worker training regulations:	CDSS (Linne Stout) and CalSWEC (Barry Johnson)	Evidence of completion of step 5.2 (5.2.1 through 5.2.2).	Q5	Done 05/09/11	

5.2.1 Develop and distribute Frequently Asked Questions ACIN in response to ACIN (released 7/08) on implementation of new training regulations.		Issued ACINs for new implementation of training regulations and FAQs to counties.	Q1	Done 11/17/09	<p>The ACIN (I-21-09) on Training Regulations was issued July 2008 and the ACIN on Questions & Answers was issued March 2009. Copies of the ACINs provided as evidence of completion.</p> <p>The State submitted the ACIN 1-21-09 dated March 12, 2009, which references ACL 08-23. (CBRO 11/17/09)</p>
5.2.2 Modify county training plans to incorporate annual tracking report of core training participation by social workers.		Modified plans on file and annual tracking report.	Q5	Done 05/09/11	<p>Modified plans and annual tracking report submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>Modified plans on file and annual tracking report.</p> <p>Pending –State needs to clarify which section of the training plan were modified to ensure that tracking reports of core training participation occurs. (CBRO 5/27/10)</p> <p>The CDSS provided the requested additional documentation to demonstrate the changes from an old tracking system to the new. (CBRO 05/09/11)</p>
5.3 Strengthen concurrent planning training.	CDSS (Linne Stout),	Evidence of completion of step 5.3 (5.3.1 through 5.3.3).	Q8	Done 08/09/11	

5.3.1 Revise common core social worker training to enhance concurrent planning content.	CalSWEC (Barry Johnson)	Excerpts of revised sections of curriculum.	Q7	Done 05/09/11	<u>Excerpts of revised sections of curriculum submitted as evidence of completion.</u>
5.3.2 Revise advanced concurrent planning curriculum for CWS staff, attorneys, care providers and other community partners.		Excerpts of revised sections of curriculum.	Q4	Done 08/23/10	Excerpts of revised sections of curriculum submitted as evidence of completion.
5.3.3 Provide training based on the new curriculum.		Two training agendas.	Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u>	Copy of two training agendas submitted as evidence of completion.
5.4 Develop curriculum on mental health, domestic violence, substance abuse, and education for juvenile court system and implement distance learning on these topics.	AOC (Jennifer Walter; Leah Wilson)	Online training available on domestic violence and mental health (web link provided).	Q5	Done 05/09/11	<p>Web link and copies of online training on domestic violence and mental health provided as evidence of completion.</p> <p><i>The training curriculum that was provided is limited to psychotropic medication and how to satisfy court requirements for youth needing meds. It does not include information about mental health, domestic violence, substance abuse or education for juvenile court system on these topics. In addition, the weblink was not included. The CDSS can add the web-link to this section of the PIP report. (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>The CDSS provided additional information, including copies of courses that are available of the AOC-managed website. Some of the courses are</p>

					consistent with those identified in this actions step. (CBRO 05/09/11)
Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks					

Primary Strategy: 6. Strengthen implementation of the statewide safety assessment system.		Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Safety Outcomes 1 and 2			
Goal: To improve timeliness of investigations and enhance services to families to ensure safety of child.		Applicable CFSR Items: Items 1, 2, 3, 4			
Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Status of EOC	Quarterly Update
6.1 Review timeliness to investigation quarterly data with counties that are not in	CDSS (Richard Smith)	Contact with counties and technical assistance provided.	Q8	Done 05/09/11	Documentation of contact with counties/TA provided as evidence of completion.

<p>line with the State's median performance level; provide technical assistance as indicted.</p>					<p><i>On 11/02/10 the CDSS submitted consultation forms as evidence of providing T&TA with the counties. We strongly urge the state to revise its use of the forms as they are not very informative and do not appear to be useful as they were submitted to CB. For example, the form indicates only the raw number of Immediate and 10-day referral in a county. It does not indicate the county's baseline or target or provides an assessment about whether the county is moving in the right direction. In addition it does not provide information about what the county is doing to address the issue and what CDSS is doing to assist the county.</i></p> <p><i>We understand from CDSS staff that these data are monitored on a quarterly basis and that the forms are generated only if a county falls below a 90% timely response threshold. The state will need to provide additional forms to show the county's baseline or target or provides an assessment about whether the county is moving in the right direction. In addition it does not provide information about what the county is doing to address the issue and what CDSS is doing to assist the</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>county. (CBRO 12/08/10)</p> <p><u>Original EOC sent Nov. 2, 2010 at 8:56 a.m.</u></p> <p><u>Clarification sent via email to Region IX, Dec 13, 2010 at 10:04 a.m.; December 14, 2010 at 2:54 p.m. (to J, Toscano); January 28, 2011 at 1:40 p.m.; March 29, 2011 at 8:56 a.m.</u></p> <p>The ACF has requested that the state provide additional documentation to better demonstrate how the state was provide technical assistance to counties as a result of reviewing their data (CBRO 05/09/11)</p>
6.2	Strengthen implementation of the safety, risks, strengths, and needs assessment.	CDSS (Linne Stout)	Evidence of completion of step 6.2 (6.2.1 through 6.2.5).	Q8	<p><u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u></p>
6.2.1	Enhance training of trainers' curriculum by incorporating data reviews as a method for supervisors to monitor timely completion of safety, needs and risk assessments.		Excerpts of enhanced training curriculum.	Q3	<p>Done 05/12/10</p> <p>Excerpts of enhanced training curriculum provided as evidence of completion.</p>

6.2.2 Provide training at the county level to build supervisor capacity to monitor fidelity to the safety assessment tool.	RTA trainers	Two RTA training agendas.	Q3	Done 05/12/10	Two RTA training agendas related to fidelity to the safety assessment tool.
6.2.3 Develop and deliver advanced training module on Interviewing for Strengths and Needs and “Writing Individualized Case Plans” in conjunction with family members.	CDSS (Linne Stout)	Advanced training module and one training agenda.	Q4	Done 09/07/10	<p>Copy of advanced training module and training agenda submitted as evidence of completion.</p> <p>6.2.3—pending--The documents that were submitted as evidence of completion are the class syllabi only. The CDSS needs to also provide information with the dates and times that the trainings were made available as per the PIP. (CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p>In addition to the training module e the state provided a list of training attendees from a number of counties to document that training occurred (CBRO 09/07/10)</p>
6.2.4 CDSS to conduct quarterly review of safety and risk assessment data to ensure increases in the use of safety/risk assessments in a timely manner prior to case closing.	CDSS (Richard Smith)	PIP quarterly report with data on increase in use of safety/risk assessments as indicated in 6.2.4.	Q1 through Q8		<p>Quarterly review completed, see Part B.</p> <p>These data are reported in the measures for Item 4 (2 measures) (CBRO 11/30/09) Provided for 1st QRT</p> <p>Data reported for measure related to Item 4—(CBRO) provided for 2nd QRT</p> <p>Data reported for measure related to item 4 provided for 4th QRT.</p> <p>Data reported for measure related</p>

					<p>to Item 4 (provided for 3rd QRT (CBRO 5/27/10)</p> <p>Data reported for measure related to Item 4 (provided for 4th QRT (CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p><i>Data reported for measure related to Item 4 (provided for 5th QRT (CBRO 12/08/10)</i></p> <p>Data reported for measure related to Item 4 (provided for 6th and 7th QRTS (CBRO 05/09/11)</p> <p>Data reported for measure, see Part B (8th Qrt).</p>
6.2.5 CDSS to conduct quarterly review of FSNA data to ensure increases in the use of strengths and needs assessments.	CDSS (Richard Smith)	Quarterly report of administrative data PIP quarterly report with data on increase of FSNA as indicated in 6.2.5.	Q1 through Q8	<u>Done</u> <u>08/09/11</u>	<p>Quarterly review completed, see Part B.</p> <p><i>These data are reported in the data measure for Item 3 (CBRO 11/30/09) Provided for 1st QRT</i></p> <p><i>Data reported for measure related to Item 3—(CBRO) provided for 2nd QRT</i></p> <p><i>Data reported for measure related to Item 3 provided for 4th QRT.</i></p> <p>Data reported for measure related to Item 3 (provided for 3rd QRT (CBRO 5/27/10)</p> <p>Data reported for measure related to Item 3 (provided for 4th QRT (CBRO 8/23/10)</p> <p><i>Data reported for measure related to Item 3 (provided for 5th QRT</i></p>

					<p>(CBRO 12/08/10)</p> <p>Data reported for measure related to Item 4 (provided for 6th and 7th QRTS (CBRO 05/09/11</p> <p>Data reported for measure, see Part B (8th Qrt).</p>
Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks					

State: California

Type of Report: ☐ PIP ☒ Quarterly Report: Quarter: 8 Date Submitted: 07/29/2011

V: National Standards Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report

Safety Outcome 1: Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence	
National Standard	94.6%
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	92.6%/2006b2007a

Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	92.7/FFY 2008 92.6%/2006b2007a											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	93.3%											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	93.2%											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
	93.0 (01/08-12/08)	--	<u>ACH</u> 93.2 (10/08-09/09)	--	--	--	--	--				

Safety Outcome 1: Absence of Maltreatment of Children in Foster Care												
National Standard	99.68%											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	99.49%/2006b2007a											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	99.71%/FFY 2008											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	State met standard.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				

Permanency Outcome 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification												
National Standard	122.6 (scaled score)											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	107.2 (scaled score)/2006b2007a											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	108.6 (scaled score)/FFY 2008 107.1 (scaled score)/2006b2007a											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	111.7											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	110.2											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
	110.0 (08B09A)	110.6 (FFY2009)	--	ACH 110.8 (rev. FFY2009)	--	--	--	--				

Permanency Outcome 1: Timeliness of Adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)												
National Standard	106.4 (scaled score)											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	94.6 (scaled score)/2006b2007a											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	99.7 (scaled score)/FFY 2008 95.3 (scaled score)/2006b2007a											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	103.8											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	99.2											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
	ACH 99.8 (08B09A)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				

Permanency Outcome 3: Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Extended Time Periods (Permanency Composite 3)												
National Standard	121.7 (scaled score)											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	106.2 (scaled score)/2006b2007a											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	113.1 (scaled score)/FFY 2008 107.0/2006b2007a											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	116.3											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	110.0											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
	ACH 113.1 (08B09A)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				

Permanency Outcome 1: Placement Stability (Permanency Composite 4)												
National Standard	101.5 (scaled score)											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	92.2 (scaled score)/2006b2007a											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	92.9 (scaled score)/FFY 2008 92.5 (scaled score)/2008b2009a											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	95.7											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	95.3											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
	92.5 (08B09A)	92.9 (FFY 2009)	92.9 (FFY 2009)	--	--	--	FFY 2010ab 93.5	FFY 2010B/ 2011A 94.0				

B. Item-Specific and Quantitative Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report

Outcome: Safety 1		Item: 1 Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment											
National Standard	95.0%												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	In 86.0% of cases reviewed, the agency responded in a timely manner.												
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	94.5% of investigations responded to in a timely manner FFY 2008.												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	94.7% of CWS and Probation cases using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets. [Baseline+Std. Error; .945+.0018; 61875 applicable cases]												
Method of Measuring Improvement	Of all referrals open for investigation during the quarter (baseline annualized for FFY 2008) the % that are investigated in a timely manner (CWS/CMS-quarterly data; state measure 2B retrieved from CDSS/UCB website, http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare). Denominator will be all required immediate and ten-day investigations summed. Numerator will be the number of immediate and ten-day investigations completed as required summed. On a rolling quarterly basis, this proportion is annualized using the sum of the quarterly numerators and dividing by the sum of the quarterly denominators.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	94.7% (1/08-12/08)	ACH 95.2% (04/08-03/09)	--	--	--	--	--	--					

Outcome: Permanency 1 Item: 7 Permanency goal established in timely manner												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	In 59% of cases reviewed, the permanency goal was established in a timely manner.											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	In 74.6 72.5 % of out-of-home cases, permanency goal was established within 60 days of entry into foster care/FFY 2008.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	75.3% of CWS out of home cases using the Children's Bureau method for establishing targets. [Baseline+Std. Error; .746+.0074; 13276 applicable cases]											
Method of Measuring Improvement	The denominator is the number of first time entries in care for 60 days or more during the quarter. The numerator is the number of those cases without a "missing" with a case plan goal established within 60 days of entry into foster care . On a rolling quarterly basis, this proportion is annualized using the sum of the quarterly numerators and dividing by the sum of the quarterly denominators.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
	74.2 73.1 (01/08-12/08)	69.2 74.0 (04/08-03/09)	67.8 74.4 (07/08-06/09)	68.3 75.6 (10/08-09/09)	Target Met	--	--	--				

Outcome: Permanency 1		Item: 10 Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement											
Performance as Measured in Final Report	In 28% of cases reviewed, the permanency goal was other planned permanent living arrangement.												
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	In 14.7% of out-of-home cases, permanency goal was other planned permanent living arrangement/FFY 2008												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	14.4% of CWS cases using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets. [Baseline+Std. Error; .147-.0027; 66413 applicable cases]												
Method of Measuring Improvement	AFCARS Data Profile Section III, Permanency Goals for Children in Care. Numerator is the number of children for whom permanency goal is “Long Term Foster Care”. The denominator is the number of children in care of the last day of the reporting period.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	<u>ACH</u> 13.8 (08B09A)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--					

Outcome: Well-Being		Item: 18 Child and family involvement in case planning											
Definition/Methodology	The percentage of cases, open on the last day of the quarter that have had a Family Engagement Effort (FEE) contact with a Parent/Child/Caregiver within the report period. The total number of TDMs that occurred in the (#) TDM counties (denominator) and the number of TDMs that indicate a parent (birth parent, adoptive or guardian) was involved (numerator), quarterly. One year's data utilizing the rolling quarter method.												
Data Source	CWS/CMS administrative data Quarterly TDM data via UC Berkeley to CDSS (annualized).												
Baseline and Baseline Period	Baseline to be determined PIP Q4 (Q4 data to be reported in Q7 due to revise in methodology). In 56.7 percent of cases, a parent was involved in the TDM process.												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined PIP Q4 (Q4 data to be reported in Q7 due to revise in methodology) using the Children's Bureau method for establishing targets. 57.0% of TDMs will have a parent involved [Baseline+Std. Error; .567-.0059; 26,740 applicable cases]												
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quarterly state data from CWS/CMS (annualized); Items include Case Planning with Family, Outreach with Family, Mediation with Family, Family Meeting/TDM/Family Case Conferencing, Meeting w/ Community Partners and Family, Meeting w/ Foster Parents and Family, Meeting w/ Parent Partners and Family, Meeting w/ CalWorks Staff and Family. The denominator is the total number of TDMs that occurred and the numerator is the total number of TDMs that indicate a parent was involved (Parent is defined as birth parent, adoptive parent or guardian). On a rolling quarterly basis, this proportion is annualized using the sum of the quarterly numerators and dividing by the sum of the quarterly denominators.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	--	--	--	56.7%	57.06% Target Met	57.63%	--	--					

Outcome: Permanency 2		Measurement of Action Step 2.1- Family Finding											
Definition/Methodology	The percentage of CWS entry cases at 60 days who indicate placement with a relative on the last day of the quarter.												
Data Source	CWS/CMS administrative data.												
Baseline and Baseline Period	Baseline to be determined PIP Q5.												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined PIP Q5 using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets.												
Method of Measuring Improvement	The denominator is the number of first time entries during the quarter. The numerator is the number of first time entry cases where placement was with a relative within 60 days of entry. On a rolling quarterly basis, this proportion is annualized using the sum of the quarterly numerators and dividing by the sum of the quarterly denominators.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	Using the Children's Bureau method for establishing targets, improvement goal = 26.7% [Baseline+Std. Error; -256+0.073; 5863 applicable cases] 31.91 % [Baseline+Std. Error; .313 + 0.0059; 23,474 applicable cases]												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	--	--	--	--	CWS/CMS Adm. Data 25.6% Baseline 31.32% (01/09 – 12/09)	CWS/CMS Adm. Data 28.5% 31.37% (04//09 – 03/10)	Target Met 31.3% (07/09 – 6/10)	ACH 31.91% (10/09 – 09/10)					

Outcome: Well-Being 1		Item: 17 Needs and services of child, parent and foster parent.											
Definition/Methodology	Percentage of foster care and in-home children as of the last day of the quarter who are receiving Wraparound services.												
Data Source	Quarterly reports from county to CDSS.												
Baseline and Baseline Period	5.4% of open cases were receiving Wraparound services/Calendar Yr. 2008												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	5.6% of CWS cases using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets. [Baseline+Std. Error; .054+.0017; 64838 applicable cases]												
Method of Measuring Improvement	The denominator is the total number of children in foster care as of the last day of the quarter, extracted from the automated case management system (CWS/CMS). The numerator is the total number of county-reported wraparound slots as of the last day of the quarter. On a rolling quarterly basis, this proportion is annualized using the sum of the quarterly numerators and dividing by the sum of the quarterly denominators.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	<div>ACH</div> <div>5.9%</div> <div>(FFY 09)</div>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--					

Outcome: Safety 2		Item: 3 Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal											
Definition/Methodology	The percentage of CWS cases opened during the quarter where a family strengths and needs assessment was completed.												
Data Source	CWS/CMS administrative data extracted via SafeMeasures®												
Baseline and Baseline Period	61.8% of cases/FFY 2008												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	62.3% of cases using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets. [Baseline+Std. Error; .618+.0046; 41733 applicable cases]												
Method of Measuring Improvement	The denominator is the total number of case referrals that were promoted to open cases during the quarters. The numerator is the total number of those promoted cases where a completed family strengths and needs assessment (FSNA) was completed. On a rolling quarterly basis, this proportion is annualized using the sum of the quarterly numerators and dividing by the sum of the quarterly denominators.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	<u>ACH</u> 63.8% (1/08-12/08)	65.5% (4/08-3/09)	66.7 % (7/08-6/09)	67.7% (10/08-9/09)	67.2% (1/09 – 12/09)	65.3% (4/09 - 3/10)	63.0% (7/09 – 6/10)	61.4% (10/09 – 9/10)					

Outcome: Safety 2		Item: 4 Risk of harm to child											
Definition/Methodology	The percentage of CWS family maintenance (FM) and family reunification (FR) cases closed during the quarter where a safety assessment was completed within 65 days prior to case closing. ¹												
Data Source	CWS/CMS administrative data extracted via SafeMeasures®												
Baseline and Baseline Period	22.8% of cases/FFY 2008												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	23.2% of cases using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets. [Baseline+Std. Error; .228+.0041; 40003 applicable cases]												
Method of Measuring Improvement	The denominator is the total number of CWS family maintenance and family reunification cases closed during a quarter. The numerator is the number of those closed cases that had a safety assessment completed within 65 days prior to closing. On a rolling quarterly basis, this proportion is annualized using the sum of the quarterly numerators and dividing by the sum of the quarterly denominators.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	22.0% (1/08-12/08)	<u>ACH</u> 24.0% (4/08-3/09)	23.5% (7/08-6/09)	24.7% (10/08-9/09)	24.4% (1/09 – 12/09)	23.2% (4/09 - 3/10)	22.8% 7/09 – 6/10)	20.7% (10/09 – 9/10)					

¹ Sixty-five (65) days is the indication in the SDM Procedure Manual. These measures are only for SDM counties and do not include CAT counties.

Outcome: Safety 2		Item: 4 Risk of harm to child											
Definition/Methodology	The percentage of CWS family maintenance (FM) and family reunification (FR) cases closed during the quarter where a risk assessment was completed within 65 days prior to case closing.												
Data Source	CWS/CMS administrative data extracted via SafeMeasures®												
Baseline and Baseline Period	60.1%/FFY 2008												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	60.6% of cases using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets. [Baseline+Std. Error; .601+.0048; 40003 applicable cases]												
Method of Measuring Improvement	The denominator is the total number of CWS family maintenance and family reunification cases closed during a quarter. The numerator is the number of those closed cases that had a risk assessment completed within 65 days prior to closing. On a rolling quarterly basis, this proportion is annualized using the sum of the quarterly numerators and dividing by the sum of the quarterly denominators.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	<div>ACH</div> <div>63.4%</div> <div>62.2%</div> <div>(1/08-12/08)</div>	63.1%	63.5%	64.6%	64.8%	64.3%	63.7%	62.9%					
		(4/08-3/09)	(7/08-6/09)	(10/08-9/09)	(1/09 – 12/09)	(4/09 - 3/10)	(7/09 – 6/10)	(10/09 – 9/10)					

Outcome: Well-Being 1		Item: 19 Caseworker Visits with Child											
Definition/Methodology	The percentage of cases rated as a “strength” in quality of visits.												
Data Source	Online case review.												
Baseline and Baseline Period	Baseline to be determined PIP Q2; Baseline = 83.2% quality visits.												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined PIP Q2 using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets.												
Method of Measuring Improvement	Online reviews from CWS/CMS of 381 cases from Los Angeles, Fresno and Santa Clara the 12 largest counties² regarding quality of visits. Definition of quality of visit will be consistent with federal CFSR. Data will be reported annually.												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	Using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets, improvement goal = 83.4%-85.0%. [Baseline+Std. Error; .832+.0023 0.0245168; 97393 381 applicable cases]												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
	--	CWS/CMS Data 83.2% (baseline)	--	--	--	--	--	CWS/CMS Data 85.82% (strength 327 cases) <u>CDSS confirmed on 08/09/11 that the denominator was 381 cases (CBRO 08/09/11)</u>					

² Twelve Counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Clara.

Outcome: Well-Being 1		Item: 20 Caseworker Visits with Parents										
Definition/Methodology	The percentage of cases rated as a “strength” in quality of visits.											
Data Source	Online case review.											
Baseline and Baseline Period	Baseline to be determined PIP Q2; Baseline = 63.1% quality visits.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined PIP Q2 using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets.											
Method of Measuring Improvement	Online reviews from CWS/CMS of 381 cases from Los Angeles, Fresno and Santa Clara the 12 largest counties³ regarding quality of visits. Definition of quality of visit will be consistent with federal CFSR. Data will be reported annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	Using the Children’s Bureau method for establishing targets, improvement goal = 63.4% 65.5%. [Baseline+Std. Error; .631+.0030 0.0316428; 97393 381 applicable cases]											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
	--	CWS/CMS Data 63.1% (baseline)	--	--	--	--	--	CWS/CMS Data 70.34% (strength 268 cases) <u>CDSS confirmed on 08/09/11 that the denominator was 381 cases (CBRO 08/09/11)</u>				

³ Twelve Counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Clara.